

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/863,750	05/23/2001	Yoshihiko Gotoh	Ishii Case 17	9121	
75	90 04/19/2005	EXAMINER LOPEZ, CARLOS N			
FLYNN, THI	EL, BOUTELL & TAN				
2026 Rambling Road Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1699			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Kalamazoo, 141	4,5000-10,55		1731	1731	
			DATE MAILED: 04/19/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/863,750	GOTOH ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Carlos Lopez	1731	

•	Carlos Lopez	1731						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>30 March 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.						
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advi	$\cdot$							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL								
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
AMENDMENTS								
3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOw);	TE below);						
(c)⊠ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		jected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	•		(DTOL 204)					
4. Lighthe amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-32 5. Dighther Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
<ol> <li>Devision of the following rejection (s).</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	·	, timely filed amendm	ent canceling					
7. Sor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: <u>15</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>13,14 and 16-19</u> .	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ill be entered and an	explanation of					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>2-12</u> .								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	_	- • —						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to one showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:					
12. 🔲 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 13. 🔲 Other:								

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Response to Arguments Applicant's arguments filed 3/25/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the newly field limitation limiting the glass slab ingot be manufactured from silica powder distinguishes it from the Sayce reference. Applicant notes that synthesis burners provide the silica for the furnace. However, the burners are notoriously known in the art to provide silica soot, which are silica powders.

Applicant appears to try to distinguish the claimed invention by emphasizing that the silica particles in the instant invention are derived from refined natural quartz crystal powder (See Page 7 lines 6th to last line). When in fact the claimed invention requires any type of silica particle from any source, which encompasses silica particles made by silica synthesis burners as done in Sayce.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "silica powders from being made by the fusion of refined natural quartz crystal powders and dropping the powders around the center of a rotatable furnace bed" and "that the fused silica powder extends horizontally by centrifugal force produced by rotating the furnace and the dimension of the silica ingot is defined by the cross-section of the furnace") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlos Lopez whose telephone number is 571.272.1193. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571.272.1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CL.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700